

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 8, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 60, 66, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 78, 81, 88, 103, and 104 have been amended. Claims 86, 87, 90, 92, 93, and 106 have been cancelled. Claims 60 and 88 are the independent claims. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended, and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed March 8, 2006, the drawings were objected to because the specification did not refer to elements 9 and 25. In response, the specification has been amended to refer to these elements. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore requested.

Claim 60 has been amended to refer to 500nm rather than 100nm, and claim 66 has been amended to refer to 100nm rather than 500nm. Withdrawal of the objection to these claims is accordingly requested.

Claims 69 and 70 have been amended to delete the word "that". Withdrawal of the objection to these claims is accordingly requested.

Claims 86, 87, 90, 92, 93 and 106 have been canceled.

With respect to the rejection of claim 74 (alum or polymer treatment), claim 76 (electromagnetic radiation treatment), and claim 97 (alum, polymer, or electrolytic or corona discharge treatment) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, it is respectfully submitted that the specification provides adequate support for these claims to persons of ordinary skill in the art (see, page 13, lines 7 to 14, and page 11, lines 22 to 24). Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is accordingly requested.

With respect to the rejection of various claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claims 74, 75, 76, 78 and 81 have been amended to recite "said treating step" to make the claims uniform and to overcome this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is accordingly requested.

The dependency of claim 104 has been changed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection of this claim is accordingly requested.

Independent claims 60 and 88 have been amended to recite that no binder is used. Support for this amendment to the claims appears in the Specification at page 5, lines 27 to 31, which states that the applied layer of elementary pigment particles does not have to include a binder. It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest this limitation. In view of

this amendment to independent claims 60 and 88, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons that independent claims 60 and 88 are patentable. Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By



Michael C. Stuart
Reg. No. 35,698
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: July 10, 2006